

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments and remarks herein.

Upon entry of this amendment, claims 1 and 3-7 will be pending. By this amendment, claims 1 and 5-7 have been amended, and claim 13 has been canceled.

§102 Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-7

In Section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Redford et al. (U.S. Patent 5,711,672; hereinafter referred to as "Redford"). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Regarding claim 1, as shown above, claim 1 has been amended and calls for:

1. (Currently Amended) An information processing apparatus for reading data from a detachable predetermined recording medium, comprising:

loading detection means for detecting the loading of a recording medium into said information processing apparatus, wherein said recording medium stores data including one or more images, and each of said one or more images has a type;

starting means for starting, in response to the loading of said recording medium detected by said loading detection means, a resident application program for processing said data stored on said recording medium, wherein said resident application program is already stored in said information processing apparatus before said recording medium is loaded into said information processing apparatus;

unloading detection means for detecting the unloading of said recording medium from said information processing apparatus; and

ending means for ending, in response to the unloading of said recording medium detected by said unloading detection means, said resident application program;

PATENT

Appl. No. 09/845,994

Attorney Docket No. 450100-03203

wherein said resident application program reads one or more of said one or more images from said recording medium and generates a thumbnail image for said one or more read images according to the type of said one or more read images so that said thumbnail image presents a small image representation specific to said one or more read images.

Accordingly, in one aspect of claim 1, the resident application program generates a thumbnail image according to the type of the read image(s). The resident application program uses different generation processes for different types of images. For example, in one implementation, the resident application program provides one process for MPEG, one for TIFF, one for JPEG, and so on. The resulting thumbnail image reflects the corresponding image(s). For example, in one implementation, for moving image data the thumbnail image is an image based on the first image in the sequence of images in the moving image data, while for a still image the thumbnail image is an image based on the still image (e.g., a smaller version of that image). (See the Specification at page 25, and Figure 7.) Using different generation processes, the resident application program advantageously provides specific processing for multiple types of images. Presenting a thumbnail image, rather than a generic icon, the resident application program advantageously provides an image corresponding to the specific image(s) and so makes it easier for a user to understand specifically what the thumbnail image represents.

Claim 1 has been amended and the Examiner's arguments presented in rejecting claim 1 in Section 3 of the Office Action do not appear to apply to amended claim 1. It does not appear that these arguments address generating a thumbnail image as called for in amended claim 1.

In rejecting claim 13 in Section 7, the Examiner appears to argue that it would be obvious to combine Redford and Bott (Using Windows 95, Que 1995; referred to herein as "Bott") to provide generating thumbnail images. Were the arguments presented with respect to claim 13

applied to amended claim 1, it does not appear that those arguments would show claim 1 as a whole. In particular, the Examiner appears to argue that Bott shows generating thumbnail images, referring to Bott at pages 61 and 66, and Figure 2.5. However, it appears that these portions of Bott show using icons rather than thumbnail images. It appears that these icons provide visual representations of data files by file type, but it does not appear that the Examiner's arguments would establish how these icons show thumbnail images that present a small image representation specific to the corresponding image(s). Therefore, it does not appear that these arguments would establish that the combination of Redford and Bott show amended claim 1.

Accordingly, it does not appear that the Examiner has established how Redford, as referenced by the Examiner in rejecting claim 1, shows or suggests at least these aspects of amended claim 1, and so it is submitted that the Examiner has not established how Redford shows or suggests amended claim 1 as a whole. Claim 4 depends from claim 1, and it is also submitted that the Examiner has not established how Redford shows or suggests claim 4, through its dependence on claim 1. Similar arguments apply to claims 5-7.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1 and 4-7 are not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Redford, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1 and 4-7 based upon 35 U.S.C. §102(b) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claim 3

In Section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redford in view of Sato (U.S. Patent 6,067,398; hereinafter referred to as “Sato”). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

Claim 3 depends from claim 1. As discussed above, it is submitted that the rejection of claim 1 has been overcome. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 3 has also been overcome through the dependence of claim 3 on claim 1.

Based upon the foregoing, it is submitted that claim 3 is not anticipated by nor rendered obvious by the teachings of Redford and Sato, as presented and referenced by the Examiner. Accordingly, it is submitted that the Examiner’s rejection of claim 3 based upon 35 U.S.C. §103(a) has been overcome by the present remarks and withdrawal thereof is respectfully requested.

§103 Rejection of Claim 13

In Section 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Redford in view of Bott (Using Windows 95, Que 1995; referred to herein as “Bott”). As shown above, claim 13 has been canceled thereby obviating the rejection thereto, and so it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, entry of this amendment, and the allowance of this application with claims 1 and 3-7 is respectfully solicited.

In regard to the claims amended herein and throughout the prosecution of this application, it is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §§101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

In the event that additional cooperation in this case may be helpful to complete its prosecution, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number written below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: Hans R. Mahr, Reg. No. 46,138 for

William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800